

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF OREGON

OREGON NATURAL DESERT ASS'N,      )  
WESTERN WATERSHEDS PROJECT,      )  
NORTHWEST ENVIRONMENTAL      )  
DEFENSE CENTER, OREGON WILD,      )  
CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL      )  
DIVERSITY, FOREST GUARDIANS, and )  
FRIENDS OF OREGON'S LIVING      )  
WATERS,      )  
                                        )  
Plaintiffs,      )  
                                        )  
vs.      )  
                                        )  
UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE,      )  
                                        )  
Defendant.      )  
\_\_\_\_\_

Civil Case No. 07-634-AS

ORDER

vs.

UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE,

Defendant.

Peter M. Lacy  
Oregon Natural Desert Association  
917 S.W. Oak Street, Suite 408  
Portland, Oregon 97205

Melissa Powers  
Pacific Environmental Advocacy Center  
10015 S.W. Terwilliger Blvd.  
Portland, Oregon 97219

Kristin F. Ruether  
Advocates for the West  
P. O. Box 1612  
Boise, Idaho 83701

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Karin J. Immergut  
United States Attorney  
District of Oregon  
Stephen J. Odell  
Assistant United States Attorney  
1000 S.W. Third Avenue, Suite 600  
Portland, Oregon 97204

Ronald J. Tenpas  
Assistant Attorney General  
Steven E. Rusak  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Environment & Natural Resources Division  
1961 Stout Street, 8th Floor  
Denver, Colorado 80294

Attorneys for Defendants

Damien M. Schiff  
James S. Burling  
Pacific Legal Foundation  
3900 Lennane Drive, Suite 200  
Sacramento, California 95834

Jill S. Gelineau  
Schwabe Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.  
1600-1900 Pacwest Center  
1211 S.W. Fifth Avenue  
Portland, Oregon 97204

Attorneys for Amici Curiae Applicants

KING, Judge:

The Honorable Donald C. Ashmanskas, United States Magistrate Judge, filed Findings and Recommendation on November 30, 2007. The matter is before this court. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). Plaintiffs have filed objections and defendant has filed a response.

When either party objects to any portion of a magistrate's Findings and Recommendation concerning a dispositive motion or prisoner petition, the district court must make a *de novo* determination of that portion of the magistrate's report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore Business Machines, Inc., 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), cert. denied, 455 U.S. 920 (1982).

Having given a *de novo* review of the issues raised in the objections to the Findings and Recommendation, I find no error.

Accordingly, I ADOPT Judge Ashmanskas's Findings and Recommendation (#32) and GRANT defendant's Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings (#9).

Dated this \_\_\_\_\_ 10th \_\_\_\_\_ day of January, 2008.

/s/ Garr M. King  
Garr M. King  
United States District Judge